



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/821,073	04/08/2004	Aurobinda Pradhan	15609-044001	9212

32864 7590 01/25/2008
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C.
PO BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CHAU T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/25/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/821,073

Applicant(s)

PRADHAN, AUROBINDA

Examiner

Chau Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/25/2007 has been entered. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims 1 and 12 contain subject matter "not with at least one unassociated document among multiple electronic documents" which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Although the Applicant(s) pointed out in the specification, page 4, line 11 – page 7, line 24 and Figure 1 for supporting the newly amended limitation, the examiner disagrees since the examiner finds nothing in

the specification that would support the negative limitation "not with at least one unassociated document among multiple electronic documents".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shuping et al (US 6313855, issued Nov 6, 2001) in view of Carter, US Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0052920 A1, and further in view of Day et al. (Day), US Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0154159 A1.

Regarding claims 1, 12, and 14, Shuping teaches a method to be performed in a computer system having stored therein an electronic document that has an existing association with another electronic document, the method comprising:

displaying a view of a selected electronic document on a graphical user interface, there having previously been defined for the selected document having one of several intrinsic associations with at least one other electronic document. For example, in a method for web browsing, a user selects a web page and it is rendered on the browser as a current page (see Fig 4, items 410, 450) where multiple web pages are contemporaneously displayed in a single window for a user to view (Abstract section).

The current web page includes hyperlinks (several intrinsic associations) that correspond to future web pages (other electronic documents) (col. 8, lines 1-12).

Shuping does not expressly teach displaying on the graphical user interface while displaying the view of the selected electronic document, a user-selectable command that identifies the intrinsic association that has previously been defined and causes a view of the other electronic document that is intrinsically associated with the selected electronic document to be displayed on the graphical user interface. But one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have thought it was obvious based on Shuping's disclosure. Shuping discloses, in the method for web browsing, while the current page is displayed, the user selecting the "backward" navigation button on the tool bar of the browser, which navigates user through the past history of the web page. The past pages and current pages are associated by the history of the browser (col 1, lines 60-63).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a backward navigation button on the tool bar of the browser which allowed for navigation to pages prior the current page as taught by Shuping, providing the benefit of having web browsers that display a current web page along with past web pages in a unique browsing environment (Shuping, col 1, lines 7-10).

However, Shuping does not explicitly disclose the types of intrinsic associations including at least a first intrinsic association type where the selected electronic document is a follow-up of the other electronic document, and a second intrinsic association type where the other electronic document is a follow-up of the selected

electronic document; stating which of the selected electronic document and the other electronic document is a follow up of the other; and the input control displayed separately from the selected document in the graphical user interface and configured for being used with any of multiple electronic documents displayed in the graphical user interface.

In the same field of endeavor, Carter discloses within a document, a navigation bar including a number of control items, manages the retrieval from the document storage location and display of document within the document window, and the navigation bar can include an earlier/later button that scrolls the particular navigation parameter (pages 2-3, paragraph [0036]), and Figure 2B shows results from selecting the earlier/later button and the results displayed separately from the selected document in the graphical user interface. In addition, Carter discloses the results shows the earlier button (a second intrinsic association type where the other electronic document is a follow-up of the selected electronic document) and a later button (intrinsic association types) or the later button (a first intrinsic association type where the selected electronic document is a follow-up of the other electronic document) which indicate the navigation direction for each of the navigation parameters (page 3, paragraph [0041]-[0042]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Carter with Shuping to include the types of intrinsic associations including at least a first intrinsic association type where the selected electronic document is a follow-up of the other electronic document, and a

second intrinsic association type where the other electronic document is a follow-up of the selected electronic document; stating which of the selected electronic document and the other electronic document is a follow up of the other; and the input control displayed separately from the selected document in the graphical user interface and configured for being used with any of multiple electronic documents displayed in the graphical user interface. Carter suggests that using the navigation parameters can facilitate efficient identification and display of a document (Abstract).

However, Shuping and Carter do not explicitly disclose an electronic document that is not with at least one unassociated document among multiple electronic document.

Day discloses in Figure 4B which shows a web page including link 452 to the previous page in a series of pages and link 454 to the next page in the series of pages. Day further discloses in Figure 4A which show a web page including link 418 to the next page in a series of pages, but there is no link to the previous page in a series of pages, and thus this implies the web page not with at least one unassociated page among series of pages.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Day with Shuping and Carter to include an electronic document that is not with at least one unassociated document among multiple electronic document for the purpose of associating a control with series links in a web browser.

Regarding claims 2 and 15, Shuping teaches the user-selectable command is displayed in response to a user selecting the input control in a toolbar of the graphical user interface. For example, the “backward” button on a tool bar that is selected by a user to command the browser to link and pull up the previous page (col 1, lines 60-61).

Regarding claims 3 and 16, Shuping teaches wherein the selected electronic document is intrinsically associated with each of a plurality of other electronic document. For example, in a method for web browsing, a user selects a web page and it is rendered on the browser as a current page (Shuping, see Fig 4, items 410, 450) where multiple web pages are contemporaneously displayed in a single window for a user to view (Shuping, Abstract section). The current web page is displayed in the second panel and identifies a hyperlink (which examiner interprets as a user selectable command to go to another linked page) in the current page to retrieve and render the future web page in a third panel, all embedded within a single window (Abstract section)

displaying on the graphical user interface a plurality of user-selectable commands in the input control for displaying views of the plurality of other documents, each of the plurality of user-selectable commands identifying the respective intrinsic association. For example, the “backward” button on a tool bar that is selected by a user to command the browser to link and pull up the previous page (Shuping, col 1, lines 60-61).

Regarding claim 4, Shuping, however, does not explicitly disclose wherein the intrinsic associations between the selected electronic document and each of the plurality of other electronic documents belong to any of the several types of intrinsic associations.

In the same field of endeavor, Carter discloses the navigation bar includes buttons that specify the criteria such as button could specify criteria for documents relating to a particular subject, and the navigation could include a type button that limits criteria to documents of a particular type (page 3, paragraph [0037]). In addition, Carter discloses the navigation bar includes an earlier/later button, a time button, a day of the week button, a date button, a month button, a week button, and a year button (page 3, paragraph [0040]). Moreover, Carter discloses using either the earlier button or the latter button, the day of the week can be incremented to Friday or decremented to Thursday, and these button indicate the navigation direction for each of the navigation parameters (page 3, paragraph [0042]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Carter and Shuping to include wherein the intrinsic associations between the selected electronic document and each of the plurality of other electronic documents belong to any of the several types of intrinsic associations. Carter suggests that using the navigation parameters can facilitate efficient identification and display of a document (Abstract).

Regarding claim 5, Shuping, however does not explicitly disclose grouping the plurality of user-selectable commands according to the several types of intrinsic associations.

Carter discloses in Figures 2A and 2B that user selecting earlier/later button 200 produces the navigation bar which includes earlier buttons and later buttons for each of the navigation parameters, type window button, subject window button, group size window button... (page 3, paragraph [0042]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Carter and Shuping to include grouping the plurality of user-selectable commands according to the several types of intrinsic associations. Carter suggests that using the navigation indicators, a user can vary navigation parameters and display a closest-fit document in the document window that whose identification parameters correspond closely to the previously display document.

Regarding claims 6 and 18, Shuping does not expressly teach the electronic documents forming a hierarchy, but one would interpret Shuping disclosure as rendering it obvious. Shuping discloses past, current and future web pages (col 2, lines 15-25). By applying the broadest reasonable interpretation, the examiner interprets the past, current and future as a hierarchy arranged in a temporal progression where the past web page is a parent and the future web page is a child of the current web page. This has the same logical relationship as a tree structure because the links can be and arranged and traversed like a tree structure.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret a past, current and future web page as taught by Shuping as

equivalent of a hierarchy, providing the benefit of having web browsers that display a current web page along with past web pages in a unique browsing environment (Shuping, col 1, lines 7-10).

Regarding claims 7 and 19, Shuping does not expressly teach several types of intrinsic associations provides navigation upward in the hierarchy, but one would interpret Shuping disclosure as rendering it obvious. Shuping discloses past, current and future web pages (col 2, lines 15-25). By applying the broadest reasonable interpretation, the examiner interprets the past, current and future as a hierarchy arranged in a temporal progression where the past web page is a parent and the future web page is a child of the current web page. And going to the past web page is equivalent to going to a parent page or one upward (or prior) in time. This has the same logical relationship as a tree structure because the links can be and arranged and traversed like a tree structure.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret a past, current and future web page as taught by Shuping as equivalent of a hierarchy, providing the benefit of having web browsers that display a current web page along with past web pages in a unique browsing environment (Shuping, col 1, lines 7-10).

Regarding claims 9 and 13, Shuping teaches receiving a predetermined ... command. For example, the “backwards” button is a command on the tool bar which is existing before and provides user with functionality (col 1, lines 59-63).

Shuping teaches in response to receiving ... one other electronic document. For example, upon user selecting the “backwards” command, displaying the past web pages prior to the current page (col 1, lines 59-63).

Regarding claim 10, Shuping teaches ceasing to display the view of the selected electronic document upon displaying at least one other electronic document. For example, in a conventional browser, upon the user selecting the “backward” button, the conventional browser stops displaying the “current” web page and moves on to display the immediately previous web page (col 2, lines 15-22).

Regarding claim 11, Shuping does not expressly teach displaying another user-selectable command in the input control on the graphical user interface that identifies the intrinsic association and causes the view of the selected document to be displayed on the graphical user interface.

In the same field of endeavor, Carter discloses within a document, a navigation bar including a number of control items, manages the retrieval from the document storage location and display of document within the document window, and the navigation bar can include an earlier/later button that scrolls the particular navigation parameter (pages 2-3, paragraph [0036]). Carter also discloses in Figure 2B which

shows results from selecting the earlier/later button and the results displayed separately from the selected document in the graphical user interface.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Carter and Shuping to include displaying another user-selectable command in the input control on the graphical user interface that identifies the intrinsic association and causes the view of the selected document to be displayed on the graphical user interface. Carter suggests that using the navigation parameters can facilitate efficient identification and display of a document (Abstract).

Claim 17, Shuping, however, does not explicitly disclose wherein the intrinsic associations between the selected electronic document and each of the plurality of other electronic documents belong to any of the several types of intrinsic associations, and wherein the plurality of user-selectable commands is grouped according to the several types of intrinsic associations.

In the same field of endeavor, Carter discloses the navigation bar includes buttons that specify the criteria such as button could specify criteria for documents relating to a particular subject, and the navigation could include a type button that limits criteria to documents of a particular type (page 3, paragraph [0037]). In addition, Carter discloses the navigation bar includes an earlier/later button, a time button, a day of the week button, a date button, a month button, a week button, and a year button (page 3, paragraph [0040]). Moreover, Carter discloses using either the earlier button or the

latter button, the day of the week can be incremented to Friday or decremented to Thursday, and these button indicate the navigation direction for each of the navigation parameters (page 3, paragraph [0042]). Carter discloses in Figures 2A and 2B that user selecting earlier/later button 200 produces the navigation bar which includes earlier buttons and later buttons for each of the navigation parameters, type window button, subject window button, group size window button... (page 3, paragraph [0042]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Carter and Shuping to include the intrinsic associations between the selected electronic document and each of the plurality of other electronic documents belong to any of the several types of intrinsic associations, and wherein the plurality of user-selectable commands is grouped according to the several types of intrinsic associations. Carter suggests that using the navigation indicators, a user can vary navigation parameters and display a closest-fit document in the document window that whose identification parameters correspond closely to the previously display document.

Regarding claims 8 and 20, Shuping does not expressly teach association categories provides navigation upward in the hierarchy, but one would interpret Shuping disclosure as rendering it obvious. Shuping discloses past, current and future web pages (col 2, lines 15-25). By applying the broadest reasonable interpretation, the examiner interprets the past, current and future as a hierarchy arranged in a temporal progression where the future web page is a child of the current web page. And going to the future

web page is equivalent to going to a child page or one down (or future) in time. This has the same logical relationship as a tree structure because the links can be arranged and traversed like a tree structure.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret a past, current and future web page as taught by Shuping as equivalent of a hierarchy, providing the benefit of having web browsers that display a current web page along with past web pages in a unique browsing environment (Shuping, col 1, lines 7-10).

Response to Arguments

In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that

A) "Applicant specifically disagrees with the Examiner's reasoning on page 3, lines 4-19 of the office action, and request that the Examiner identify a proper reference as the basis for every claimed feature." (see page 8 of the remarks)

In reply to argument A, in order to support the examiner's reasoning, Day discloses displaying a browser window with a menu interface and toolbar interface for selection of next and previous page links in the series of pages, and the browser provides right-click menu (user selectable command) that provides menu items associated with next page and previous page links (intrinsic associations).

B) "Carter nowhere discloses or suggests intrinsic associations between documents." (see page 8 of remarks)

In reply to argument B, Carter discloses the results shows the earlier button (a second intrinsic association type where the other electronic document is a follow-up of the selected electronic document) and a later button (intrinsic association types) or the later button (a first intrinsic association type where the selected electronic document is a follow-up of the other electronic document) which indicate the navigation direction for each of the navigation parameters (page 3, paragraph [0041]-[0042]).

C) Prior art does not disclose user-selectable command that navigates not to an unassociated document (see page 8 of remarks).

In reply to argument C, applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 12 and 14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as explained here below, necessitated by Applicant's substantial amendment (i.e., an electronic document has an existing association not with at least one unassociated document among multiple electronic documents) to the claims which significantly affected the scope thereof.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4092. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton, can be reached at (571) 272-4137.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. On July 15, 2005, the Central Facsimile (FAX) Number will change from 703-872-9306 to 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chau Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2176

/Doug Hutton/
Doug Hutton
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100